

SECTION II—REMARKS

The following remarks are provided in response to the Office Action mailed June 30, 2006 in which the PTO:

- rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent Application Publication 2002/0054309 to Rao (“Rao”).
- rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,782,463 to Schmisser et al. (“Schmisser”).
- rejected claims 2, 4, 7, and 9-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao.

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application for the following reasons:

Claim 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rao. Applicants herein cancel claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 without prejudice.

Claim 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schmisser. Applicants herein cancel claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 without prejudice.

Claim 2, 4, 7, and 9-30 rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2, 4, 7, and 9-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao. Applicants herein cancel claims 2, 4, 7, 9-12, 15, and 20-30 without prejudice.

As to claim 13, applicants respectfully request the removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in light of the present amendments to said claim and the following clarification. Claim 13 recites the limitation of a **content addressable memory (CAM)** component as disclosed in the original specification pg 10 ln 9-15 and as depicted in figure 3. In particular, claim 13 recites “**a content addressable memory component performing content based searches of the first and second shared memory stores.**” Rao does not disclose this limitation, nor does Rao provide the motivation of doing so.

As to claims 14 and 16-19, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as said claims depend on an allowable independent claim. If an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is also non-obvious. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, independent claim 13 is now in condition for allowance, and therefore claims 14 and 16-19 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable independent claim 13, as well as by virtue of the features recited therein.

New Claims 31-60

As to claims 31, 46, and 55, applicants recite the limitation of a **content addressable memory (CAM)** component just as discussed above in reference to claim 13. In particular, claims 31, 46, and 55 recite “**a content addressable memory component to perform content**

based searching” of the first and second **“memory stores.”** Rao does not disclose this limitation, nor does Rao provide the motivation of doing so. Claims 31, 46, and 55 are therefore in condition for allowance as each claim recites limitations not disclosed by the PTO in its 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rao rejection, set forth above.

As to claims 32-45, 47-54, and 56-60, applicants respectfully submit that all are in condition for allowance as said claims depend on an allowable independent claim. If an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is also non-obvious. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The claims each incorporate the **“content addressable memory”** component limitation from their corresponding independent claim as discussed immediately above, and therefore each is in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claims 32-45, 47-54, and 56-60 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable independent claims 31, 46, and 55, as well as by virtue of the features recited therein.

Conclusion

Given the above amendments and accompanying remarks, all claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance. If the undersigned attorney has overlooked a teaching in any of the cited references that is relevant to allowance of the claims, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such teaching may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (503) 439-8778.


Charge Deposit Account

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fee(s) that may be due in this matter, and please credit the same deposit account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: September 20, 2006



Gregory B. Caldwell
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,926

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles CA 90025-1030
Phone: (503) 439-8778
Facsimile: (503) 439-6073